

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

Claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 17, 20, and 22-34 are active in the present application. Claim 25 is amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 30-34 are new claims. Support for the new claims is found on pages 10, 13, and 14 of the specification.

No new matter is added.

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Office for withdrawing the rejections of the Office Action of December 8, 2006. The Office now rejects the claims over patents to Yoshinaga (U.S. 5,973,042) and Karakalle (U.S. 5,091,443), alone or in combination with one or more other prior art references. The Office states that Yoshinaga and Karakalle disclose water-absorptive polymer particles that have been treated with a silane compound (see page 3, lines 17-19 and page 5, lines 4-6 of the Office Action of August 20, 2007). Applicants submit that the disclosure of a polymer particle treated with a silane such as a silane-coupling agent does not disclose or suggest the polymer particles of the presently claimed invention which are chemically bonded to a silicone compound.

Applicants submit that it is readily recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art that a silane and a silicone are different. Yoshinaga discloses prior art silanes at column 5, lines 10-21. Karakalle discloses silane coupling agents at column 3, lines 38-57. Applicants submit that the silanes of Yoshinaga and Karakalle are not silicones. As support, Applicants submit herewith a technical definition of silicone obtained from "Glossary of Chemical Terms," C.A. Hampel et al., 1976, p. 245. It is readily evident from the attached technical definition that a silicone is a compound that has one or more Si-O-Si linkages. None of the silane materials disclosed in Yoshinaga or Karakalle have the silicone linkage required in order for a chemical material to be a silicone. Because neither of Yoshinaga or Karakalle disclose or suggest all of the present claim limitations, the cited prior art cannot anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections.

Applicants draw the Office's attention to new Claims 30-34. The new dependent claims further define the silicone recited in the present claims. Applicants submit that the new dependent claims are further patentable over the prior art of record at least because the

prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the particular silicone compounds recited in the new dependent claims.

The Office also rejected the claims under obviousness-type double patenting in view of 10/137,405 further in view of Yoshinaga and Shin. As already stated above the cited prior art does not disclose the silicone-bonded compound of the present claims. Any rejection relying on the prior art's disclosure of silane treated compounds is different from the presently claimed invention and cannot therefore provide sufficient evidence of obviousness. The obviousness-type double patenting is therefore not supportable and should be withdrawn.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit the rejections are not supportable and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Stefan U. Koschmieder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,238

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)